

REMARKS

This is a request for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114(c) and is responsive to the outstanding final Office Action dated February 22, 2006. Reexamination, reconsideration, and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this request for continued examination, claims 1-36 are pending in this application. Claim 1 and 13-30 are directly amended herein, and claims 32-36 are newly added. It is believed that the foregoing amendments add no new matter to the present application.

Response to §102 Rejections

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See, *e.g.*, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim 1

Claim 1 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Hite et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,040). Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A computer program product for program level message traffic interception comprising:
 - a computer-readable medium;
 - a display device for displaying a graphical user interface for receiving data indicative of a user-selected type of an event and data indicative of at least one user-selected operation to be performed on a message if the user-selected type of event occurs;***
 - an interface communication emulator module for translating an incoming message from an interface into a translated message in a standard format and for communicatively transmitting the translated message; and
 - a protocol-independent API core module stored on the medium, the API core module configured to receive the translated

message, determine what type of an event has occurred based upon the contents of the translated message, and ***perform the at least one user-selected operation on the message based upon the user-selected type of event.*** (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Hite* fails to disclose at least the features of pending claim 1 highlighted hereinabove. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In this regard, *Hite* appears to teach the following:

CAN input message processor 102 is operable to receive input messages and parse the fields of the message to determine a message destination. The message destination specifies a software logical device to receive the message. Recall that software logical device may represent a device on a control area network or an Internet application on the Internet. Device state maintenance process 104 is operable to determine a current state of a software logical device and to determine a next state in response to the processed message. Device state storage 106 is operable to store state transition logic of each software logical device for use by device state maintenance process 104.

See *Hite*, column 6, lines 48-67. Such messages that are received and parsed are received from the Web Server 13 (*Hite*, FIG. 2) and are simply passed on to the software logical device based upon a destination address in the message. There is no “user-selected type of event” that dictates “a user-selected operation” that is to be performed on the message by the software device emulator 90 (*Hite*, FIG. 5) when the message is received.

Further, *Hite* discloses that messages are transmitted between a master controller 324 (*Hite*, FIG. 10) and one of the logical software devices, for example the fire protection systems 50 or the HVAC systems 51. Such message format is shown in *Hite* in FIG. 11. Further, TABLE A (*Hite*, column 12-column 17) defines a list of valid commands that may be included in the message. The listed commands are sent in the message from the master controller 324 to

the logical software devices (or from the logical software devices to the master controller) based upon a destination address in the message. Nowhere does *Hite* teach that a user selects a “user-selected type of event” and the master controller performs a “user-selected operation” on the message based upon the “user-selected type of event.” Furthermore, TABLE A does not list types of events, TABLE A lists commands that are included in the messages that are merely transmitted to the logical software devices based upon the destination address in the message.

It does appear that *Hite* teaches a “CAN Browser U I/F” for receiving data from a user. It appears from *Hite* that such data may include an identification of a logical software device and an operation to be performed on the logical software device. See *Hite*, column 3, line 66-column 5, line 3. However, it does not appear that the “CAN Browser U I/F” is for receiving data indicative of “a user-selected type of an event and data indicative of at least one user-selected operation to be performed on a message if the type of event occurs,” as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, it does not appear that *Hite* teaches “a display device for displaying a graphical user interface for receiving data indicative of a user-selected type of an event and data indicative of at least one user-selected operation to be performed on a message if the type of event occurs” and an “API core module configured to...perform the at least one user-selected operation on the message based upon the user-selected type of event,” as claimed in claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant asserts that *Hite* is inadequate to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-31

Claims 2-31 were in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by *Hite*. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claims 2-31 contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. Since claim 1 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 2-31 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 32

Claim 32 is newly added. Claim 32 reads as follows:

32. A system for program level message traffic interception, comprising:
a first interface configured to receive and transmit messages;
a second interface configured to receive and transmit messages;
a testing device intermediate the first and second interfaces, the testing device comprising logic configured to receive from a user, via a user interface, test scenario data indicative of parameters describing a test to be performed on messages received from the first or second interface, the parameters comprising user-selected event data describing an event that may occur during the transmission of messages between the first and second interface, the parameters further comprising user-selected operation data indicative of at least one operation to be performed if the event occurs, the logic further configured to receive a first message in a first specific protocol from one of the first or second interfaces, translate the received message from its first specific protocol into a translated message in a standard protocol, determine if the event has occurred based on contents of the translated message and the user-selected event data, and perform the operation if the logic determines that the event has occurred based on the user-selected operation data.

Applicant submits that the cited art fails to teach or disclose those limitations contained in claim 32. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 32 in its pending form.

Claims 33-36


Applicant submits that the pending dependent claims 33-36 contain all features of their respective independent claim 32. Since claim 32 should be allowed, pending dependent claims 33-36 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

LANIER FORD SHAVER & PAYNE, P.C.

By: 
Ann I. Dennen
Reg. No. 44,651

2101 W. Clinton Avenue, Suite 102
Huntsville, Alabama 35805
(256) 713-2264